



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

new emphasizes the inspiration of men. (2) The old regarded the process of inspiration as different from other human experience; the new regards it as of the same sort as ordinary human experience; the old emphasized the element of divine dictation, which has come down uncritically from scribal Judaism; the new rejects that altogether and builds only on the element of experience. (3) The old regards the product of inspiration as being in all parts perfect in historical and theological statement, but not necessarily in literary form or in ethical teaching; the new does not regard inspiration as guaranteeing perfection of all parts in any of these particulars. (4) The primal cause of all difference is that the old theory was constructed on the basis of a deductive inference from the perfection of God, while the new theory is built on the basis of inductive reasoning from the facts of the Bible and of life. The author then offers this tentative definition: Biblical inspiration is the personal influence of God which so guided all who took part in producing the Bible that they made a body of literature unique in religious value, and, so far as we now see, final in religious teaching.

The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels.

Behind our first three gospels lie two, perhaps three, main sources, says an anonymous writer upon "The Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels," in the *Church Quarterly Review* for April. One of these sources is Mark's gospel, which, if not written by the disciple of Peter, yet dates from the third quarter of the first century, and comes to us accredited with the assent and trust and employment of the church of that early period. The second is a collection of discourses which may very possibly be a translation of the apostolic work mentioned by Papias. If so, it comes to us with a special claim upon our belief. If not, yet the character of its contents, as will be shown later, approves it to us as a work of very great value and high antiquity. The third source is a not dissimilar work used by the writer of the third gospel and highly estimated by him. To put the matter in another way, Mark's gospel is a unity, sources for which have not at present been discovered with any great degree of certainty. The first gospel can be analysed. The author has used Mark's gospel as a framework into which he has woven sayings from the *Logia*, adding other material from unknown sources. The third gospel is also a composite work. Imbedded in it lie Mark's gospel, sayings from the *Logia*, and matter from a special source the origin of which is unknown. Of the author of the

second gospel we have already spoken. The author of the first gospel is unknown. From the end of the second century it has been ascribed to Matthew, probably because it contained so large an element of the collection of sayings ascribed by Papias to that apostle. A tradition dating from the same period ascribes the third gospel to Luke. While it remains certain that this gospel and the Acts of the Apostles come from the hand of the same writer, some modern critics find reasons for denying that he can have been the companion of Paul; but the arguments against the Lukan authorship are very inconclusive. Whether the gospel be the work of Luke, however, or of an unknown writer, it is, as its writer himself informs us, a composite work, based upon written sources, and the value of these sources must be determined by the same methods in either case.

The church has always recognized the human element in the composition of the books of the New Testament, and the preface to Luke's gospel tells us quite clearly that that gospel was composed by the author out of materials partly written, partly oral. When we investigate the sources of Luke's material, therefore, we are attempting what historical criticism naturally demands and what the New Testament itself suggests. The divine inspiration has always worked through human means and agents, and in accordance with the methods of thought and language of the time. The divine character of the gospel is not diminished because the personality of the gospel writers asserts itself, just as the divine origin of the gospel was not obscured because it was presented colored by the individuality of Peter, or Paul, or John.